REMARKS

In the Office Action, Claims 4, 12, 14, 15, 27, 29, 30, 42 and 44 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,917,722 (Bloomfield). The rejections are respectfully traversed and the Examiner is requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in light of the following comments.

The present invention concerns accessing an address based on a predetermined image included in a picked-up image. According to the invention, a device monitors whether or not a predetermined image is included in a received image, which is picked-up by an image pickup device that is controlled based on a control command that controls a direction of the image pickup device. If the predetermined image is included in the received image, an address corresponding to the predetermined image is extracted from the received image. The extracted address is then accessed based on the result of the monitoring and when a user performs a process to designate the predetermined image.

With specific reference to the claims, amended independent Claim 12 is an access system, comprising an operation device for outputting a control command of a direction of an image pickup device, a receiving device for receiving an image picked up by the image pickup device which is controlled based on the control command of the direction of the image pickup device, and a control device for extracting an address corresponding to a predetermined image included in the image received by the receiving device, a monitoring device for monitoring whether the image received by the receiving device includes a predetermined image, and an accessing device for accessing the address extracted by the control device corresponding to the predetermined image if the monitoring

- 6 -

device monitors that the received image includes the predetermined image and a user performs an operation to designate the predetermined image.

Amended independent Claims 27 and 42 are method and computer program claims, respectively, that substantially correspond to Claim 12.

The applied art of Bloomfield is not seen to disclose or to suggest the features of independent Claims 12, 27 and 42, and in particular, is not seen to disclose or to suggest at least the features of outputting a control command of a direction of an image pickup device, and receiving an image picked up by the image pickup device which is controlled based on the control command of the direction of the image pickup device, monitoring whether the received image includes a predetermined image, and accessing an extracted address corresponding to the predetermined image if the received image includes the predetermined image.

Initially, Applicant notes that Bloomfield is wholly different from the present invention in that it relates to scanning a text image (e.g., a URL), recognizing an address corresponding to the scanned text image, and transmitting the address to a terminal whereby the terminal connects to the address. In contrast, the invention outputs a control command of a direction of an image pickup device, and receives an image picked up by the image pickup device based on the control command. The received image is monitored to determine if a predetermined image is included therein, and then an address corresponding to the predetermined image is accessed. Nowhere does Bloomfield teach the use of outputting a control command to control a direction of the image pickup device (i.e., scanner) and to then receive an image picked up by the device that is controlled by the

- 7 -

control command.

The Office Action fails to point out where the foregoing features are disclosed on Bloomfield. Instead, the Office Action merely asserts that the Bloomfield teaches the foregoing features, but only cites Bloomfield's recognition of characters. The recognition of characters is clearly not the same as outputting a control command to control a direction of an image pickup device, and then receiving an image picked up by the device that is controlled based on the output control command. Thus, Bloomfield simply fails to teach the features of the invention.

In view of the foregoing, the Examiner is requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections.

No other matters having been raised, the entire application is believed to be in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

REQUEST FOR INTERVIEW

In the event that the rejections are not withdraw, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner contact Applicant's undersigned representative to arrange for an interview to the discuss the rejections.

- 8 -

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa,

California office by telephone at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to

be directed to our address listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Attorney for Applicant
Edward A. Kmett
Registration No. 42,746

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

CA_MAIN 111744v1

- 9 -